

Appl. No. 09/662,533  
Amdt. dated Sept. 20, 2004

REMARKS

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse action in any of these claims, the Examiner should telephone Mr. Peter L. Michaelson, Esq. at (732) 530-6671 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Examiner interview

On September 1, 2004 and commencing at approximately 10 AM, both the Applicants' attorney, Mr. Peter L. Michaelson, Esq., and the Assignee's UK patent agent, Mr. Hugh Wright, the latter being in London, conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner.

Both Messrs. Michaelson and Wright not only thank the Examiner for the opportunity to have conducted an interview with her but also sincerely appreciate all the courtesies which she graciously extended to them during that interview.

Through the interview, Messrs. Michaelson and Wright discussed with the Examiner the outstanding rejection, as set forth in the final action mailed May 24,

Appl. No. 09/662,533  
Amdt. dated Sept. 20, 2004

2004, of claims 1-4, as they then stood, as being anticipated under 35 USC § 102(b) in view of the teachings of the Choi patent (US patent 5,734,824 issued March 31, 1998 to I. P. Choi).

The Examiner stated that the method in claim 1 merely recited that the position of each end station on a network was resolved but did not recite how each such station was determined to actually be an end station. Agreement was then reached with the Examiner to the effect that if claim 1 were to be amended to include recitations, such as through inclusion of appropriate language from allowed claim 5, directed to how an end station is determined as such, then the resulting amended claim would likely be allowable.

In response, the Applicants have now amended claim 1 along the lines agreed to with the Examiner.

Claim status

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b)

Through the final action mailed May 24, 2004, the Examiner has finally rejected claims 1-4, as filed, as being anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(b) in view of the teachings of the Choi patent (United States patent 5,734,824 issued to I. P. Choi on March 31, 1998).

Appl. No. 09/662,533  
Amdt. dated Sept. 20, 2004

In view of the amendments now made to claim 1 pursuant to the agreement reached with the Examiner during the interview, the Applicants submit that this rejection is now moot.

Allowed claims


The Examiner has allowed claims 5 and 6, which the Applicants appreciate.

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102.

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both consideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney  
Reg. No. 30,090  
Customer No. 007265  
(732) 530-6671

September 20, 2004

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES  
Counselors at Law  
Parkway 109 Office Center  
328 Newman Springs Road  
P.O. Box 8489  
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

Appl. No. 09/662,533  
Amdt. dated Sept. 20, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Cornelia Arenz  
Type or print name of person signing certification

Cornelia Arenz  
Signature

September 20, 2004  
Date

(3COM81RCEPREAMEND/ca:99)

Page 8 of 8